

*Citation for published version:*

Wang , M-Y, Ings, TC, Proulx, MJ & Chittka, L 2013, 'Can bees simultaneously engage in adaptive foraging behaviour and attend to cryptic predators?', *Animal Behaviour*, vol. 86, no. 4, pp. 859-866.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2013.07.029>

*DOI:*

[10.1016/j.anbehav.2013.07.029](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2013.07.029)

*Publication date:*

2013

*Document Version*

Early version, also known as pre-print

[Link to publication](#)

## University of Bath

### Alternative formats

If you require this document in an alternative format, please contact:  
[openaccess@bath.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@bath.ac.uk)

**General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

**Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

1 **FINAL DRAFT AUTHOR COPY, FOR COPY OF RECORD:**

2 <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0003347213003515>

3 Wang, M. Y., Ings, T. C., Proulx, M. J., & Chittka, L. (2013). Can bees  
4 simultaneously engage in adaptive foraging behaviour and attend to cryptic  
5 predators? *Animal Behaviour*, 86, 859-866.

6  
7 **Can Bees Simultaneously Engage in Adaptive Foraging Behaviour and Attend to**  
8 **Cryptic Predators?**

9  
10 Mu-Yun Wang<sup>a</sup>, Thomas C Ings<sup>ab\*</sup>, Michael J Proulx<sup>ac</sup> and Lars Chittka<sup>a</sup>

11  
12 a. Biological and Experimental Psychology Group, School of Biological and  
13 Chemical Sciences, Queen Mary University of London

14 b. Present address: Animal & Environment Research Group, Department of Life  
15 Sciences, Anglia Ruskin University, Cambridge, UK.

16 c. Present address: Department of Psychology, University of Bath

17  
18 \* Corresponding author: Thomas C Ings

19 Animal & Environment Research Group

20 Department of Life sciences

21 Anglia Ruskin University

22 East Road

23 CAMBRIDGE CB1 1PT

24 Tel: + 44 (0)1223 69 8614

25 Fax: +44 (0)1223 417712

26 e-mail: [thomas.ings@anglia.ac.uk](mailto:thomas.ings@anglia.ac.uk)

28 Bees foraging for nectar often have to discriminate between flowers with similar  
29 appearance but different nectar rewards. At the same time, they must be vigilant for  
30 ambush predators, such as crab spiders, which can camouflage themselves on flowers.  
31 Here we ask whether bees can efficiently discriminate similar flower colours while  
32 exposed to predation threat from cryptic predators. Bees were individually tested in  
33 tightly controlled laboratory experiments using artificial flowers whose nectar supply  
34 was administered with precision pumps. Predation risk was simulated by automated  
35 crab spider ‘robots’ that captured bees for a limited duration without injuring them.  
36 Bees’ behaviour was monitored by a 3D video tracking system. We experimented  
37 both with cryptic and conspicuous spiders, finding that bees had no difficulty avoiding  
38 conspicuous spiders while still foraging adaptively. Conversely, they prioritised  
39 predator avoidance at the expense of maximising energy intake when faced with  
40 detecting cryptic predators and a difficult colour discrimination task. This difference  
41 in behaviour was not due to cognitive limitations: bees were able to discriminate  
42 between similar flower types under predation risk from cryptic spiders when choosing  
43 the safe flower type incurred a gustatory punishment in the form of bitter quinine  
44 solution. However, this resulted in bees incurring substantially higher costs in terms  
45 of floral inspection times. We conclude that bees have the capacity to attend to

46 difficult foraging tasks while simultaneously avoiding cryptic predators, but only do

47 so when avoidance of gustatory punishment justifies the increased costs.

48

49 keywords: attention, bumblebees, *Bombus terrestris*, foraging, predator avoidance,

50 predator crypsis, visual search

51

52 Animals are exposed to a constant flow of complex sensory input. Foragers, for  
53 example, must prioritize information relevant to important tasks, such as locating the  
54 most rewarding food items or detecting predators (Milinski 1984; Godin & Smith  
55 1988; Clark & Dukas 2003). For many animals, such as bees, foraging and visual  
56 search often require a trade-off between attending to the foraging target (e.g. flowers)  
57 and focusing on potential danger in the environment (e.g. sit-and-wait predators on  
58 flowers). A foraging bee will spend most of its time choosing between visual targets  
59 (flowers) that vary in colour, shape, and pattern – and is under constant pressure to  
60 select the most rewarding flowers while minimizing predation risk and energetic costs  
61 (Chittka & Menzel 1992). The task can be challenging and highly dynamic since there  
62 are distractor flowers, i.e. other plant species with different traits (Schaefer & Ruxton  
63 2009) and camouflaged predators in the field (Morse 2007). Many plant species, such  
64 as those in the orchid family, have flowers which resemble the appearance or odour of  
65 co-occurring, rewarding species to attract pollinators (Dafni 1984; Roy & Widmer  
66 1999). Moreover, predators can use the attractiveness of flowers to lure their prey. For  
67 example, crab spiders (Araneae: Thomisidae) are sit-and-wait predators that ambush  
68 pollinators, such as bees, on flowers (Chittka 2001; Insausti & Casas 2008). Some  
69 species of crab spiders can reversibly change their body colour to match that of the

70 flower they are hunting on (Morse 1986). They even preferentially hunt on high  
71 quality flowers (Morse 1986), which are also preferred by foraging bees (Menzel et al.  
72 1993; Heiling et al. 2004).

73       We have a good understanding of the individual problems facing foraging bees:  
74 how they choose between different flowers (Giurfa & Lehrer 2001; Shafir et al. 2003;  
75 Chittka and Raine 2006) and how they interact with predators (Heiling & Herberstein  
76 2004; Dukas 2005; Reader et al. 2006). Bees can associate food rewards with specific  
77 floral traits, such as colour, and can successfully discriminate between even subtle  
78 differences in traits to maximise foraging efficiency (Dyer & Chittka 2004a).

79 Furthermore, bees are able to learn to avoid both individual flowers harbouring  
80 predators and sets of flowers of a given type (colour) associated with predation risk  
81 (Ings & Chittka 2008, 2009; Jones & Dornhaus 2011). However, it is not known how  
82 bees perform when exposed to both flower colour discrimination and predator  
83 avoidance tasks simultaneously, a situation which bees must naturally face. Evidence  
84 from field studies suggests that bees may choose to avoid a patch harbouring  
85 predatory crab spiders (Dukas & Morse 2003), and laboratory studies indicate that  
86 bees may also choose to switch to a less risky flower species (Ings & Chittka 2009;

87 Jones & Dornhaus 2011). Therefore, we ask whether bees have the perceptual and  
88 cognitive processing power to carry out such tasks simultaneously.

89 Early work on insects seemed to indicate that pollinators can only efficiently deal  
90 with one task at a time (Lewis 1986), and indeed animals with substantially larger  
91 brains have extensive capacity limitations in perceptual processing resulting in  
92 significant costs associated with performing the precise discrimination of more than  
93 one stimulus dimension (Kahneman 1973; Pashler 1998; Dukas 2009). For example,  
94 in humans there are severe information processing consequences when one must  
95 divide attention between two forms of visual input as simple as shape and orientation,  
96 such that only one task can be attended to at a time (Joseph et al. 1997). Therefore, we  
97 might expect such capacity limitations to be all the more important in much smaller  
98 animals with concomitant smaller nervous systems, such as bumblebees.

99 In this study we ask whether bumblebees are able to maximise energy gains by  
100 solving a difficult colour discrimination task whilst simultaneously exposed to  
101 predation threat from camouflaged or conspicuous predators. Firstly, we exposed bees  
102 to an ecologically relevant scenario where they foraged in an artificial meadow with  
103 two visually similar flower types differing in reward quality. Visiting the highly  
104 rewarding flower type was risky because 25% of flowers harboured predatory crab

spider models. If bees are able to simultaneously solve colour discrimination and predator avoidance tasks we predict that they will visit the highly rewarding species but avoid individual flowers that are risky. Our null hypothesis is that bees are unable to attend to two difficult tasks simultaneously and that i) bees will prioritise predator detection and avoidance when predators are camouflaged and ii) they will continue to maximise energy gains when predators are highly conspicuous. Secondly, because bees did not simultaneously focus on predator avoidance and maximising energy gains we ask whether this is a result of limited cognitive capacity. In this experiment we manipulated the balance of risk and reward beyond that naturally encountered by incorporating gustatory punishment into the colour discrimination task. Under this scenario we predict that bees will be unable to focus on predator avoidance as well as discriminating between rewarding and distasteful flowers. Ultimately, we hypothesise that such limitations in sensory processing will increase indirect trait-mediated effects of predators on plants when predators are cryptic – i.e. bees will alter their foraging preferences when exposed to predation threat from camouflaged predators.

## METHODS

### *Study Animals*



Three colonies of bumblebees (*Bombus terrestris* Dalla Torre 1882) from a commercial supplier (Syngenta Bioline Bees, Weert, Netherlands) were used in the experiment. All the bees were individually tagged with number tags (Christian Graze KG, Weinstadt-Endersbach, Germany). Colonies were kept at room temperature (~23°C) and subjected to a 12 hr light/dark cycle (light on at 8am). Sucrose solution (50%, v/v) and pollen was provided ad libitum. A total of 54 foragers were used in the experiments.

#### *Experimental Apparatus*

All experiments were conducted in a wooden flight arena ( $1.0 \times 0.72 \times 0.73$  m) with a UV-transmitting Plexiglas lid. Two twin lamps (TMS 24 F with HF-B 236 TLD [4.3 kHz] ballasts, Philips, The Netherlands) fitted with Activa daylight fluorescent tubes (Osram, Germany) were suspended above the flight arena to provide controlled illumination. Artificial flowers (7×7 cm acrylic, 1 mm thick) were arranged in a four by four vertical grid on one end wall of the arena on a grey background (Fig. A1). The opposite wall contained an entrance hole through which the bees could enter the arena from the colony. Bees were able to access rewards (sucrose solution) through a hole which was 10 mm above a wooden landing platform (40×60 mm). A

141 constant flow ( $1.85 \pm 0.3 \mu\text{l}$  per minute) of sugar solution (reward) was supplied to  
142 each flower from individual syringes attached to two multi-syringe infusion pumps  
143 (KD Scientific, KD220, Holliston, USA). At each flower, the solution was delivered  
144 via silicone tubing ending in a 26G syringe needle (BD Microlance Drogheda, Ireland;  
145  $0.45 \times 13 \text{ mm}$ ) temporarily held in place in front of the hole in the wall by reusable  
146 adhesive (Blue Tack ®, Bostick, USA). A maximum droplet volume of  $4.70 \pm 0.3 \mu\text{l}$   
147 could be reached before it fell into a ‘waste pot’ which was not accessible to bees  
148 (thus mimicking a flower that had been emptied by a bee). This avoided unvisited  
149 flowers from becoming excessively rewarding and the slow refill rate prevented bees  
150 from revisiting a flower immediately after removing the reward. Re-visits did occur  
151 ( $3.59 \pm 0.4$  per flower) as we had a limited number of flowers in the arena, but these  
152 typically occurred after the bees had visited several other flowers in the arena first  
153 ( $130.84 \pm 14.7$  seconds between revisits). Robotic ‘spider arms’ (custom-built by  
154 Liversidge & Atkinson, Romford, UK) covered with sponges were set up at the base  
155 of the flowers to simulate predation attempts. The trapping mechanism enabled us to  
156 capture bees without causing physical damage. ‘Dangerous flowers’ were fitted with  
157 life-sized crab spider (*Misumena vatia*) models ( $l = 12\text{mm}$ , made from Gedeo Crystal  
158 resin) placed on the flowers above the feeding hole. The flight behaviour and position

of bees were recorded during the experiment with three dimensional coordinates of  
bee positions being calculated 50 times per second using two video cameras  
connected to a computer running Trackit 3D software (BIOBSERVE GmbH, Bonn,  
Germany).

#### *Pre-training*

All bees were allowed to fly in the flight arena without any presentation of  
floral signals for at least one day before the experiment. A constant flow ( $1.85 \pm 0.3$   
 $\mu\text{l}$  per minute) of 50% (v/v) sucrose solution was given as a food reward. Only bees  
that left the colony and fed on the flowers consistently for at least three consecutive  
foraging bouts were used in the experiments.

#### *Experimental Design*

##### *Experiment 1: Discriminating Reward Quality under Predation Risk.*

In this experiment we asked whether bees exposed to an ecologically relevant  
scenario were able to simultaneously solve a colour discrimination task to maximise

175 energy gains whilst avoiding conspicuous or camouflaged predators. Bees could  
176 choose between two types of flowers that were similar shades of yellow to human  
177 observers (neither shade of yellow reflected appreciable amounts of UV light and  
178 therefore both colours were green to bees, i.e. they stimulated predominantly the bees'  
179 green receptors; Fig. 1a). The flower colours were chosen so that bees could  
180 distinguish between them, but only with significant difficulty (see Supplementary  
181 Data). The darker shade of yellow (which was associated with high quality rewards)  
182 was distinguished from the lighter yellow shade (low quality rewards or penalties) by  
183 a colour hexagon difference of only 0.084 units, which indicates poor discriminability  
184 according to previous work (Dyer & Chittka 2004a). We also tested experimentally  
185 that the two colours were distinguishable for bees, but with difficulty (Appendix 1).

186       The high quality (dark yellow) flowers carried a risk of predation from either  
187 conspicuous or cryptic 'robotic spiders' (Ings & Chittka 2008). Twenty-five percent  
188 of the flowers harboured a spider. Conspicuous spiders were of white appearance to  
189 human observers. They absorbed UV to some extent (Fig. 1b), and they therefore  
190 appear blue-green to bees. However, some of the white spiders' reflectance still  
191 extended into the highly sensitive UV-receptor's domain below 400nm. These spiders'  
192 colour loci therefore appear very close to the uncoloured point ('bee-white', in the

centre of the colour hexagon; Fig. 1a). They were distinguished by a colour contrast (colour hexagon distance) of 0.439 units from the dark yellow flower substrate, indicating a high level of conspicuousness. The contrast provided specifically to bumblebees' green receptor is also important, since this receptor feeds into the motion-sensitive system and is thus often crucial in target detection (Dyer et al. 2008). Green receptor contrast between white spiders and their dark yellow flower backdrop is likewise large (0.104 on a scale of 0 to 1 where zero equals no contrast) indicating high detectability of the white spiders both in terms of colour contrast as well as green contrast. Conversely, cryptic spiders were dark yellow like the flowers on which they were placed, and both colour contrast (0.036 hexagon units) and green contrast (0.004) values were very low, indicating poor detectability of these spiders. As in a previous study (Ings & Chittka 2008) the spiders were only detectable using shape-from-shading cues.

Individual bees ( $N = 34$  randomly selected from 2 colonies) were initially trained to distinguish between the shades of yellow, with the darker yellow flowers containing high quality rewards (50% v/v sucrose) and the lighter yellow flowers providing low quality rewards (20% v/v sucrose). Training continued until bees made a minimum of 200 flower choices. To reach this criterion, bees returned to the nest to

211 empty their crops three to five times (number of foraging bouts: cryptic =  $4.9 \pm 0.7$ ;  
212 conspicuous =  $3.7 \pm 0.3$ , total duration in minutes: cryptic =  $45.27 \pm 3.71$ ;  
213 conspicuous =  $40.93 \pm 3.43$ ). All bees were allowed to complete their final foraging  
214 bout and return to the nest under their own volition to avoid unnecessary handling that  
215 may have influenced their predator avoidance behaviour. To prevent bees from  
216 learning the locations of high reward flowers the positions of all flowers were  
217 randomly reassigned between every foraging bout. Redistribution of flowers and their  
218 food supply (syringe needles at the end of the silicone tubing) took under five  
219 minutes, and in most cases was achieved before bees had emptied their honey crops in  
220 the nest and returned to the nest entrance tube. After initial colour discrimination  
221 training, bees were randomly assigned to one of two groups exposed to predation risk  
222 on high quality flowers (25% of flowers harboured robotic spiders) by either  
223 conspicuous (white spider model on dark yellow flower; Fig. 1) or cryptic (dark  
224 yellow spider model on dark yellow flower) spiders ( $N = 17$  in each group). Predator  
225 avoidance training lasted for a further 200 flower choices (total duration of avoidance  
226 training in minutes: cryptic =  $32.52 \pm 2.91$ ; conspicuous =  $41.32 \pm 5.09$ ). Every time a  
227 bee landed on a high reward flower with a spider (dangerous flower) it received a  
228 simulated predation attempt whereby the bee was held by the arms of a robotic crab

spider for two seconds. This emulates natural spider attacks on bumblebees where bees are grasped by the raptorial forelegs of the spider but manage to escape, avoiding immobilization by the spider's bite. As in colour discrimination training, locations of all flowers were randomly reassigned between foraging bouts (number of foraging bouts: cryptic =  $4.9 \pm 0.8$ ; conspicuous =  $4.2 \pm 0.3$ ).

## *Experiment 2: Discriminating Gustatory Punishment and Reward under Predation*

### *Risk*

To determine whether the apparent inability of bees to solve colour discrimination and cryptic predator avoidance tasks simultaneously was due to limitations in sensory processing or attention we conducted a second experiment where the balance of risk and reward was adjusted beyond that naturally encountered. In this experiment, a third group of bees ( $N = 10$  from colony 3) was given an additional incentive to discriminate between the shades of yellow flower by replacing the low quality rewards with a form a gustatory punishment, a distasteful (bitter) quinine hemisulfate solution that bees rapidly learn to avoid (Chittka et al. 2003). This solution contained no sucrose. Bees do not ingest this solution and abort flower visits immediately upon tasting it. It has been demonstrated empirically that such

punishment generates much stronger discrimination than simply rewardless flowers that need to be distinguished from rewarding flowers (Chittka et al. 2003). Thus, bees were initially trained to distinguish between dark yellow rewarding flowers containing 50% v/v sucrose solution and light yellow distasteful flowers containing 0.12% quinine solution. After colour discrimination training for 200 flower choices (see Experiment 1, total duration in minutes =  $37.79 \pm 3.78$ ) bees were then exposed to predation risk (25%) from cryptic spiders (the hardest predator avoidance task) on the rewarding (dark yellow) flowers for a further 200 flower visits (total duration =  $31.75 \pm 2.33$  minutes). Locations of flowers were randomly re-assigned between every foraging bout (number of bouts: colour discrimination training =  $3.7 \pm 0.3$ ; predator avoidance training =  $4.4 \pm 0.4$ ).

#### *Data Analysis*

Individual bees' preferences for highly rewarding flowers (dark yellow) were calculated from their final 30 flower choices of the colour discrimination training phase in both experiments. These preferences were then used to determine predator avoidance during the training phase, where bees were exposed to predation risk (pairwise comparisons using paired *t* tests or Wilcoxon Signed Rank Tests if data



violated the assumptions of the *t* test – all tests were 2-tailed). For example, under the null hypothesis of no spider avoidance, a bee that chose highly rewarding flowers at a frequency of 80% at the end of training would be expected to choose dangerous flowers (2 dangerous flowers out of 8 highly rewarding flowers) with a probability of  $0.8 \times 0.25 = 0.2$ .

The time bees spent investigating and feeding on flowers was calculated from time and position data recorded using Trackit 3D software. Investigating zones were 7 cm (length) by 9 cm (width) by 9 cm (height) from landing platforms, and the feeding zones were 4.5 cm by 1 cm by 1 cm from the feeding hole. Investigating zones were set based on the visual angles of bumblebees where bees were able to detect both flower signals and predators using colour contrast (Spaethe et al. 2001) and feeding zones were based on observation of the position bees take whilst feeding at the flowers. Only instances when bees landed and fed on the flowers were considered as choices. Investigation duration was quantified as the time spent in the investigation zone before landing on a flower, or choosing to depart (when bees rejected the flowers without landing). Data were analysed using R (v. 2.15.1) and JMP (v. 7, SAS Institute). Four bees which lost motivation (i.e. stopped foraging) during training were excluded from the analysis (2 per group in Experiment 1).

283

## 284 RESULTS

### 285 *Discrimination Learning*

286 Bees in both experiments were trained to differentiate between two similar  
287 shades of yellow flower. In the first experiment, colour discrimination was reinforced  
288 by differences in reward quality, whereas in the second experiment it was reinforced  
289 by the use of a gustatory punishment in the lighter shade of flowers versus sugar  
290 reward in the dark yellow flowers. All bees commenced training without a preference  
291 (Fig. 2) for either shade of yellow, irrespective of reward level or punishment (mean  
292  $\pm 1$ SEM] percentage of dark yellow flowers selected during the first 30 choices:  
293 conspicuous spider group =  $50.0 \pm 2.25$ , cryptic spider group =  $48.7 \pm 5.4$ , quinine  
294 group =  $49.3 \pm 3.9$ ; ANOVA:  $F_{2,37} = 0.029$ ,  $P = 0.971$ ; one sample  $t$  test against  
295 random visits [50%] on pooled data for all groups of bees:  $t_{39} = -0.285$ ,  $P = 0.777$ ; Fig.  
296 2). However, by the end of the colour discrimination training, bees in Experiment 1  
297 had developed a slight, but significant preference (Fig. 2) for the dark yellow flowers  
298 ( $59.7 \pm 2.0$  % [pooled data for both groups] dark yellow flowers selected during the  
299 last 30 choices; one sample  $t$  test [against 50%]:  $t_{29} = 4.853$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ). Furthermore,  
300 colour discrimination was significantly greater in Experiment 2 where bees were

incentivised by bitter quinine in the light yellow flowers ( $83.3 \pm 4.0$  % dark yellow flowers selected:  $t$  test [Experiment 1 versus Experiment 2],  $t_{38} = -5.710$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ; Fig 2).

#### *Discriminating Reward Quality under Predation Risk*

Both groups of bees in Experiment 1 rapidly learnt to avoid robotic spiders (Fig. 3), although the initial avoidance response was stronger when spiders were conspicuous (Fig. 3; Mann-Whitney  $U$  Test:  $U = 197.5$ ,  $N_1 = N_2 = 15$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ). By the end of training, both groups visited virtually no dangerous flowers (median percentage during the last 30 choices for both groups = 0.0 and the inter-quartile range = 3.3; Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test:  $T = 4.790$ ,  $N = 30$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ; Fig. 3). However, the two groups differed significantly in their ability to simultaneously discriminate between similar shades of yellow flowers in order to maximise their energy intake (mean percentage of safe, highly rewarding flowers chosen during the last 30 choices: cryptic spiders =  $36.7 \pm 2.8$ , conspicuous spiders =  $52.7 \pm 4.4$ ;  $t$  test:  $t_{28} = 3.097$ ,  $P = 0.004$ ; Fig. 2). Bees encountering conspicuous spiders regained their slight preference for high reward flowers (one sample  $t$  test against random visits [37.5 %]:  $t_{14} = 3.483$ ,  $P = 0.004$ ) whereas bees exposed to cryptic spiders failed to discriminate between

high and low reward flower types and foraged from all safe flowers at random (one sample  $t$  test against random visits [37.5 %]:  $t_{14} = -0.300$ ,  $P = 0.769$ ).

Exposure to predation risk had no significant impact on the average time spent inspecting flowers (comparison of mean duration before and after spiders were added, paired  $t$  test: conspicuous spider group:  $t_{14} = 0.003$ ,  $P = 0.998$ ; cryptic spider group:  $t_{14} = 1.354$ ,  $P = 0.197$ , Fig. 4).

#### *Discriminating Gustatory Punishment and Reward under Predation Risk.*

When failure to choose the correct shade of yellow flower incurred a gustatory punishment (distasteful quinine), rather than a lower quality reward, bees were able to simultaneously solve the colour discrimination task and avoid cryptic predators on the rewarding flower type (Figs 2 & 3). Although bees initially visited dangerous flowers at random (first 10 choices in Fig. 3), they rapidly learnt to avoid cryptic spiders after experiencing simulated predation attempts (median percentage during the last 30 choices = 3.3 and the inter-quartile range = 3.3; Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test:  $T = 2.805$ ,  $N = 10$ ,  $P = 0.005$ ; Fig. 3). Furthermore, they were able to simultaneously maintain their high level of colour discrimination (mean percentage of safe, highly

rewarding flowers chosen during the last 30 choices =  $78.7 \pm 5.0$ ; one sample  $t$  test against random [37.5 %]:  $t_9 = 8.276$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ; Fig. 2).

Once exposed to predation threat, bees spent 28% more time inspecting flowers before making their choices than they did before learning about predation risk (paired  $t$  test,  $t_9 = 7.442$ ,  $P < 0.001$ , Fig. 4). This increase in investigation time was also significantly greater than observed for bees exposed to conspicuous spiders in the first experiment ( $t_{23} = 3.697$ ,  $P = 0.001$ ; Fig. 4).

## DISCUSSION

In this study we presented bees with two natural tasks that potentially lead to attentional competition (Kahneman 1973; Pashler 1998; Dukas 2009). The first task was to maximise energy intake by using subtle differences in flower colour to differentiate between reward quality. The second was to detect and avoid predators that were either conspicuous or cryptic. We found that when predator detection was difficult, bees prioritised predator avoidance over floral colour discrimination. However, when bees were forced to make the colour discrimination by use of a gustatory punishment in the distractor flowers, bees were able to solve both colour

353 discrimination and predator avoidance tasks simultaneously. Solving both tasks did  
354 not come for free, since bees incurred substantially increased inspection times when  
355 trying to avoid both predators and quinine penalties. Therefore, we argue that  
356 prioritisation of predator detection when predators are cryptic is a strategy employed  
357 by bees, rather than being due to a fundamental limitation to attend to only one task at  
358 a time (Lewis 1986). As in other tasks, for example sensorimotor learning (Chittka &  
359 Thomson 1997) or the formation of visual object concepts (Avargues-Weber et al  
360 2012b), it appears that bees can in principle juggle more than a single task, but  
361 typically do so at increased temporal costs (Chittka & Thomson 1997). Our results  
362 therefore show that bees employ a degree of attentional modulation depending upon  
363 the fine balance between risks and rewards (Spaethe et al. 2006; Giurfa 2013).

364       It has recently been suggested that bumblebees might carry out restricted parallel  
365 visual search – i.e. where the whole visual field is processed simultaneously and the  
366 targets “pop out” from distractors (Morawetz & Spaethe 2012). This being so, bees in  
367 our study might focus attention on flowers that match their search image (i.e. dark  
368 yellow flowers = highest reward in training). Conspicuous predators are highly salient  
369 and bees strongly avoided dangerous flowers right from the beginning of training (Fig.  
370 3). It is therefore likely that safe (plain) dark yellow flowers are processed as targets

and light yellow flowers and dangerous flowers are processed as distractors. In this case bees would only need to compare each flower against one search image and therefore attend to only a single visual search task.

A different pattern emerged when spiders were cryptic. Due to lack of contrast between spiders and background flowers (Fig. 1) we would expect bees to initially view dangerous flowers as desirable target flowers. Indeed, this is exactly what was observed during the first few choices made by bees in the cryptic spider group that chose significantly more dangerous flowers than bees in the conspicuous spider group during their first 30 choices (Fig. 3). Despite this, bees exposed to cryptic spiders did learn to avoid dangerous flowers, indicating that they had developed a new search image for cryptic spiders (Ings et al. 2012). Therefore, we are led to ask how bees process each flower during visual search. Avoiding dangerous flowers and maximising energy gains would require a two-step process due to the similarity between target and distractor flowers: bees could either assess flowers as spider-infested or spider-free and then discriminate between flower colours, or *vice versa*. This sequential decision making could make the assessment more costly in terms of time than the one step process necessary for avoiding conspicuous spiders (Spaethe et al. 2006; Ings et al. 2008). Our results showed that bees encountering

cryptic spiders prioritised predator avoidance at the expense of discriminating floral reward quality of the remaining safe flowers. To understand whether this failure to attend to both tasks is due to principal limitations in sensory processing and cognitive abilities (Lewis 1986; Dukas 2009) we need to consider how bees responded to predation threat in Experiment 2 when they were strongly incentivised to discriminate between the similar shades of yellow.

When one flower colour was associated with a positive value (sucrose reward) and the other with a negative value (quinine), bees were able to maintain two value-defined categories for the task (light yellow = punishment, dark yellow = reward). As a result, discrimination between light and dark yellow flowers was substantially better than in Experiment 1 (Fig. 2). Furthermore, bees also maintained this high level of discrimination under predation threat from cryptic spiders on the rewarding flowers. This difference in response compared to bees in the cryptic spider group in Experiment 1 shows that bees are able to simultaneously solve both complex visual search tasks given sufficient incentive. However, this incurs elevated temporal costs which indicate a sequential assessment of the flowers for safety (spider presence/absence) and reward level (by colour), as predicted by assuming that bumblebee are using restricted parallel visual search (Morawetz & Spaethe 2012;



Spaethe et al. 2006). Therefore, we are led to conclude that bees are able to divide their attention between two complex visual search tasks in two different contexts. This result is all the more remarkable given the failures of divided attention in related tasks in birds (Dukas & Kamil 2000) and humans (Joseph et al. 1997).

An alternative explanation to divided attention is that bees categorised (Srinivassan 2010; Avargues-Weber et al. 2012a) flowers into “good” or “bad” types, irrespective of whether penalties were predation attempts or of a gustatory nature. Light yellow flowers, which contain quinine in Experiment 2, could be classed as poor foraging options, as could dark yellow flowers harbouring cryptic spiders. Dark yellow flowers without spiders could be classed as desirable foraging options. Thus, one might assume that a bee only needs to follow a simple rule – i.e. if the flower matches the search image for ‘good’ then visit, otherwise avoid. However, the increased inspection times in the face of two undesirable types of flowers indicate that bees actively discriminate against both types of ‘bad’ flowers, i.e. a scenario based on visual target categorisation would still require the memorisation of three search images being employed simultaneously.

Finally, our results have interesting implications for the temporal costs of decision making under natural conditions. Why did bees under predation threat choose not to

engage in efficient foraging when solving the colour discrimination task would have meant feeding from flowers bearing more than twice the energetic rewards? In Experiment 2 bees had to spend a significantly (~28%) longer time inspecting flowers under predation threat from cryptic spiders (Fig. 4). Inspection of flowers is carried out in flight, which is an energetically demanding activity (Kacelnik et al. 1986; Hedenström et al. 2001), so even small increases in inspection times are likely to bear high energetic costs to bees. The increased inspection times observed in Experiment 2 can largely be attributed to the detection and avoidance of cryptic spiders (Ings & Chittka 2008; Ings et al. 2012) which can lead bees to shift to alternative safe flower types if they are as rewarding as risky flowers (Ings & Chittka 2009). Furthermore, theoretical models (Jones 2010) predict that bees can maximise lifetime foraging gains by switching to lower quality flowers when highly rewarding flowers have a higher level of predation risk. Indeed, bumblebees do appear to make optimal choices under laboratory conditions when predation risk is simulated (Jones & Dornhaus 2011), although field studies on honeybees show that they are less inclined to avoid risky but highly rewarding patches (Llandres & Rodríguez-Gironés 2011). While these differences could represent species specific responses, they are equally likely to be due to differences in the balance of risk and reward as well as the difficulty of the

visual search tasks involved. In the study by Jones and Dornhaus (2011) predators were in effect cryptic (no spider models were used) and the colour difference between high and low reward flowers was highly salient. In contrast, in our study, discrimination of high and low reward flowers was very difficult, and in some groups predators were conspicuous, as they can be in the field (Defrize et al. 2010). At least at the patch level used in our experiments, it appears that the additional costs of detecting cryptic predators (Ings & Chittka 2008; Ings et al. 2012) are outweighed by the benefits of occasionally visiting a flower with over twice the energetic rewards of the safe flower type. Furthermore, the reduced cognitive demands of detecting conspicuous predators enable bees to continue to forage from risky but rewarding species.

In summary, our study clearly shows that bumblebees are able to simultaneously discriminate floral rewards based upon subtle visual differences (colour) and avoid cryptic predators, but will only do so when the benefits outweigh the costs. These findings highlight the importance of considering sensory processing and cognitive abilities of prey when modelling predator-prey interactions (Spaethe et al. 2006; Dukas 2009; Ings & Chittka 2008; Ings et al. 2012). Furthermore, our study contributes to the growing body of evidence showing the importance of trait-mediated

indirect effects of predators (e.g. Gonçalves-Souza et al. 2008; Ings et al. 2009; Schoener & Spiller 2012). In particular we showed that the costs associated with detecting cryptic predators and discriminating similar floral colours could lead to strong trait-mediated effects on plants and may benefit mimic plant species that produce little or no floral rewards.

## REFERENCES

- Avargues-Weber, A., Mota, T. & Giurfa, M.** 2012a. New vistas on honey bee vision. *Apidologie*, **43**, 244-268.
- Avargues-Weber, A., Dyer, A. G., Combe, M. & Giurfa, M.** 2012b Simultaneous mastering of two abstract concepts by the miniature brain of bees. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **109**, 7481-7486
- Chittka, L.** 1992. The colour hexagon: a chromaticity diagram based on photoreceptor excitations as a generalized representation of colour opponency. *Journal of Comparative Physiology A: Neuroethology, Sensory, Neural, and Behavioral Physiology*, **170**, 533-543.

- 478 **Chittka, L. & Menzel, R.** 1992. The evolutionary adaptation of flower colours and the  
479 insect pollinators' colour vision. *Journal of Comparative Physiology A:*  
480 *Neuroethology, Sensory, Neural, and Behavioral Physiology*, **171**, 171-181.
- 481 **Chittka, L. & Thomson, J. D.** 1997. Sensori-motor learning and its relevance for task  
482 specialization in bumble bees. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, **41**, 385-398.
- 483 **Chittka, L.** 2001. Camouflage of predatory crab spiders on flowers and the colour  
484 perception of bees (Aranida: Thomisidae/Hymenoptera: Apidae). *Entomologia*  
485 *Generalis*, **25**, 181-187.
- 486 **Chittka, L., Dyer, A. G., Bock, F. & Dornhaus, A.** 2003. Bees trade off foraging  
487 speed for accuracy. *Nature*, **424**, 388-388.
- 488 **Chittka, L. & Raine, N. E.** 2006. Recognition of flowers by pollinators. *Current*  
489 *Opinion in Plant Biology*, **9**, 428-435.
- 490 **Clark, C. W. & Dukas, R.** 2003. The behavioral ecology of a cognitive constraint:  
491 limited attention. *Behavioral Ecology*, **14**, 151-156.
- 492 **Dafni, A.** 1984. Mimicry and deception in pollination. *Annual Review of Ecology and*  
493 *Systematics*, **15**, 259-278.

494 **Defrize, J., Théry, M. & Casas, J.** 2010. Background colour matching by a crab  
 495 spider in the field: a community sensory ecology perspective. *Journal of*  
 496 *Experimental Biology*, **213**, 1425-1435.

497 **Dukas, R & Kamil, A. C.** 2000. The cost of limited attention in blue jays. *Behavioral*  
 498 *Ecology*, **11**, 502-506.

499 **Dukas, R. & Morse, D. H.** 2003. Crab spiders affect flower visitation by bees. *Oikos*,  
 500 **101**, 157-163.

501 **Dukas, R.** 2005. Bumble bee predators reduce pollinator density and plant fitness.  
 502 *Ecology*, **86**, 1401-1406.

503 **Dukas, R.** 2009. Evolutionary biology of limited attention. In: *Cognitive Biology:*  
 504 *Evolutionary And Developmental Perspectives On Mind, Brain And Behavior*  
 505 (Ed. by L. Tommasi, L. & M. A. Peterson), pp. 147-281. London: The MIT Press.

506 **Dyer, A. G & Chittka, L.** 2004a. Biological significance of distinguishing between  
 507 similar colours in spectrally variable illumination: bumblebees (*Bombus terrestris*)  
 508 as a case study. *Journal of Comparative Physiology A*, **190**, 105-114.

509 **Dyer, A. & Chittka, L.** 2004b. Fine colour discrimination requires differential  
 510 conditioning in bumblebees. *Naturwissenschaften*, **91**, 224-227.

511 **Dyer, A. G., Spaethe, J. & Prack, S.** 2008. Comparative psychophysics of bumblebee  
 512 and honeybee colour discrimination and object detection. *Journal of Comparative*  
 513 *Physiology A*, **194**, 617-627.

514 **Giurfa, M. & Lehrer, M.** 2001. Honeybee vision and floral displays: from detection to  
 515 close-up recognition. In: *Cognitive ecology of pollination* (Ed. by Chittka, L. &  
 516 Thomson, J.), pp. 61-82: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

517 **Giurfa, M.** 2013. Cognition with few neurons: higher-order learning in insects. *Trends*  
 518 *in Neurosciences*, **36**, 285-294

519 **Godin, J.-G. J. & Smith, S. A.** 1988. A fitness cost of foraging in the guppy. *Nature*,  
 520 **333**, 69-71.

521 **Gonçalves-Souza T., Omena P.M., Souza J.C. & Romero G.Q.** 2008.  
 522 Trait-mediated effects on flowers: artificial spiders deceive pollinators and  
 523 decrease plant fitness. *Ecology*, **89**, 2407-2413.

524 **Hedenström, A., Ellington, C. P., & Wolf, T. J.** 2001. Wing wear, aerodynamics and  
 525 flight energetics in bumblebees (*Bombus terrestris*): an experimental study.  
 526 *Functional Ecology*, **15**, 417-422.

- 527 **Heiling, A.M. & Herberstein, M.E.** 2004. Predator-prey coevolution: Australian  
528 native bees avoid their spider predators. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of*  
529 *London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, **271**, S196-S198.
- 530 **Heiling, A.M., Cheng, K. & Herberstein, M.E.** 2004. Exploitation of floral signals by  
531 crab spiders (*Thomisus spectabilis*, *Thomisidae*). *Behavioral Ecology*, **15**, 321-326.
- 532 **Ings, T. C. & Chittka, L.** 2008. Speed-accuracy tradeoffs and false alarms in bee  
533 responses to cryptic predators. *Current Biology*, **18**, 1520-1524.
- 534 **Ings, T. C. & Chittka, L.** 2009. Predator crypsis enhances behaviourally-mediated  
535 indirect effects on plants by altering bumblebee foraging preferences. *Proceedings*  
536 *of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, **276**, 2031-2036.
- 537 **Ings, T., Wang, M.-Y. & Chittka, L.** 2012. Colour-independent shape recognition of  
538 cryptic predators by bumblebees. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, **66**,  
539 487-496.
- 540 **Insausti, T. C. & Casas, J.** 2008. The functional morphology of color changing in a  
541 spider: development of ommochrome pigment granules. *The Journal of*  
542 *Experimental Biology*, **211**, 780-789.
- 543 **Jones, E.I.** 2010 Optimal foraging when predation risk increases with patch resources:  
544 an analysis of pollinators and ambush predators. *Oikos*, **119**, 835–840.



545 **Jones, E.I. & Dornhaus, A.** 2011. Predation risk makes bees reject rewarding flowers  
 546 and reduce foraging activity. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, **65**,  
 547 1505-1511.

548 **Joseph, J. S., Chun, M. M. & Nakayama, K.** 1997. Attentional requirements in a  
 549 'preattentive' feature search task. *Nature*, **387**, 805-807.

550 **Kacelnik, A., Houston, A. I., & Schmid-Hempel, P.** 1986. Central-place foraging in  
 551 honey bees: the effect of travel time and nectar flow on crop filling. *Behavioral*  
 552 *Ecology and Sociobiology*, **19**, 19-24.

553 **Kahneman, D.** 1973. *Attention and effort*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

554 **Lewis, A. C.** 1986. Memory constraints and flower choice in *Pieris rapae*. *Science*,  
 555 **232**, 863-865.

556 **Llandres, A. L., De Mas, E.U. & Rodríguez-Gironés, M. A.** 2011. Response of  
 557 pollinators to the tradeoff between resource acquisition and predator avoidance.  
 558 *Oikos*, **121**, 687-696

559 **Menzel, R., Greggers, U. & Hammer, M.** 1993. Functional organization of appetitive  
 560 learning and memory in a generalist pollinator, the honey bee. In: *Insect learning:*  
 561 *Ecological and evolutionary perspectives* (Ed. by Papaj, D. R. & Lewis, A. C.), pp.  
 562 79-125. London, UK: Chapman and Hall.

- 563 **Milinski, M.** 1984. A predator's costs of overcoming the confusion-effect of swarming  
564 prey. *Animal Behaviour*, **32**, 1157-1162.
- 565 **Morawetz, L. & Spaethe, J.** 2012. Visual attention in a complex search task differs  
566 between honeybees and bumblebees. *The Journal of Experimental Biology*, **215**,  
567 2515-2523.
- 568 **Morse, D. H.** 1986. Foraging behavior of crab spiders (*Misumena vatia*) hunting on  
569 inflorescences of different quality. *American Midland Naturalist*, **116**, 341-347.
- 570 **Morse, D. H.** 2007. *Predator upon a flower: life history and fitness in a crab spider*.  
571 Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- 572 **Pashler, H.** 1998. *Attention*. East Sussex, UK: Psychology Press.
- 573 **Reader, T., Higginson, A. D., Barnard, C. J., Gilbert, F. S. & The Behavioural**  
574 **Ecology Field Course.** 2006. The effects of predation risk from crab spiders on bee  
575 foraging behavior. *Behavioral Ecology*, **17**, 933-939.
- 576 **Roy, B. A. & Widmer, A.** 1999. Floral mimicry: a fascinating yet poorly understood  
577 phenomenon. *Trends in Plant Science*, **4**, 325-330.
- 578 **Schaefer, H. M. & Ruxton, G. D.** 2009. Deception in plants: mimicry or perceptual  
579 exploitation? *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, **24**, 676-685.

580 **Schoener, T. W. & Spiller, D. A.** 2012. Perspective: kinds of trait-mediated indirect  
581 effects in ecological communities. In: *Trait-mediated indirect interactions:  
582 ecological and evolutionary perspectives* A synthesis. In (Ed. by T. Ohgushi, O.  
583 Schmitz & R. D. Holt), pp 9-27. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

584 **Shafir, S., Bechar, A. & Weber, E. U.** 2003. Cognition-mediated coevolution -  
585 context-dependent evaluations and sensitivity of pollinators to variability in nectar  
586 rewards. *Plant Systematics and Evolution*, **238**, 195-209.

587 **Skorupski, P., Doering, T. & Chittka, L.** 2007. Photoreceptor spectral sensitivity in  
588 island and mainland populations of the bumblebee, *Bombus terrestris*. *Journal of  
589 Comparative Physiology A*, 193: 485-494.


590 **Spaethe, J., Tautz, J. & Chittka, L.** 2001. Visual constraints in foraging bumblebees:  
591 Flower size and color affect search time and flight behavior. *Proceedings of the  
592 National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **98**, 3898-3903.

593 **Spaethe, J., Tautz, J. & Chittka, L.** 2006. Do honeybees detect colour targets using  
594 serial or parallel visual search? *Journal of Experimental Biology*, **209**, 987-993.

595 **Srinivasan, M. V.** 2010. Honey bees as a model for vision, perception, and cognition.  
596 *Annual Review of Entomology*, **55**, 267-284.

597


Figure 1



**Fig. 1.** (a) Appearance of yellow flowers (circles: light grey for light yellow and dark grey for dark yellow) and spiders (stars: white for conspicuous spiders and dark grey for cryptic spiders) in bee colour space (calculated using *Bombus terrestris* colour receptor sensitivity functions in Skorupski et al. 2007) relative to the grey background colour (centre of the hexagon). Positions of the colour loci in the hexagon indicate excitation differences of the three bee colour receptors. The corners of hexagon labelled UV, Blue and Green correspond to hypothetical maximum excitation of one receptor combined with zero excitation in the two others. The angular position in the hexagon (as measured from the centre) is indicative of bee subjective hue. Loci that are close together appear similar to bees and loci that are far apart appear different. (b)

610 Spectral reflectance curves of artificial flowers, spiders and the grey background of  
 611 the meadow. The dashed lines represent spiders (dark grey = dark yellow spiders and  
 612 light grey = white spiders), solid lines flowers (dark grey = dark yellow flowers and  
 613 light grey = light yellow flowers) and the dotted line represents the grey meadow  
 614 background.

Figure 2




615

616 **Fig. 2.** The mean (plus upper 95% CI) percentage of safe high reward flowers  
 617 (without spiders) chosen during consecutive blocks of 10 trials during colour  
 618 discrimination and predator avoidance training in Experiments 1 & 2. Black  
 619 represents bees exposed to cryptic spiders and light grey bees exposed to conspicuous  
 620 spiders in Experiment 1, while dark grey represents bees in Experiment 2 that were  
 621 exposed to cryptic spiders and quinine punishment in distractor flowers. The dashed

lines represent the expected percentage of high reward flowers if bees foraged completely at random, i.e. with no preference for either flower type.


**Figure 3**



**Fig. 3.** The mean (plus upper 95% CI) percentage of dangerous flowers chosen during consecutive blocks of 10 trials during avoidance training in Experiments 1 and 2. Black represents bees exposed to cryptic spiders and light grey bees exposed to conspicuous spiders in Experiment 1, while dark grey represents bees in Experiment 2 that were exposed to cryptic spiders and quinine punishment in distractor flowers. The dashed lines represents the avoidance thresholds (percentage of dangerous flowers expected if bees ignored spiders and visited all dark yellow flowers at their learnt preference level) for Experiments 1 (light grey) and 2 (dark grey). Values that lie below these lines indicate significant avoidance of dangerous flowers.


634

Figure 4



635

636 **Fig. 4.** Difference in floral investigation time between colour discrimination training  
637 and predator avoidance training (average investigating time per flower after adding  
638 spiders minus average time before adding spiders).




639

640 **Fig. A1.** Experimental setup demonstrating the artificial meadow containing two  
 641 similar shades of yellow flowers while two (25%) of the highly rewarding flowers  
 642 (dark yellow) harboured cryptic spiders. The positions of the flowers and spiders were  
 643 randomly reshuffled for each foraging bout. The spiders were white in the  
 644 conspicuous spider group.



Figure A2



**Fig A2.** Discrimination test for similar and distinct colours. The black line is the average ( $\pm$  1SEM) percentage of bees choosing rewarded flowers between easily distinguishable colours (white v. s. dark yellow), and the grey line is between colours that were hard distinguish (dark yellow v. s. light yellow). Each data point represents 10 choices.

APPENDIX 1: EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES AND RESULTS FOR THE  
PRELIMINARY COLOUR DISCRIMINATION TEST.

METHODS

The aim of the test was to find two colours which are possible, but difficult for bees to distinguish. We chose two different shades of yellow (dark yellow & light yellow) whose distance in the bee colour hexagon (Chittka 1992) was 0.084 units. It is known that bees can easily discriminate between colours 0.152 hexagon units apart but find it impossible to differentiate colours less than 0.01 units apart (Dyer & Chittka 2004b). Therefore, bees should find it difficult, but not impossible to discriminate between our chosen colours. To test this we gave bees ( $N = 5$ ) a choice between rewarding dark yellow flowers (50% v/v sucrose) and distasteful light yellow flowers containing 0.12% quinine hemisulfate salt solution. A second control group of bees ( $N = 5$ ) from the same colony were exposed to dark yellow flowers (rewarded) and easily distinguishable white flowers (punished with quinine). Individual bees in both groups were allowed to make 200 flower choices to determine whether they could learn to distinguish rewarded and punished flower colours.

## 670 RESULTS

671 All bees learnt that dark yellow flowers were rewarding as the proportion of  
672 dark yellow flowers chosen during the last 30 choices was significantly higher than  
673 that during the first 30 choices (Paired  $t$  test:  $t_4 = 2.91$ ,  $P = 0.01$ ). This confirmed that  
674 bees were able to learn to distinguish the two shades of yellow despite their high  
675 degree of similarity (Fig. A2). Furthermore, the average percentage of correct choices  
676 during the last 30 choices was significantly higher for the easily distinguishable  
677 colours (white and dark yellow flowers) than for the more similar colours (dark and  
678 light yellow) flowers ( $t$  test:  $t_4 = 2.48$ ,  $P = 0.03$ ). This confirmed that although bees  
679 are able to discriminate the two similar shades of yellow, they find the task  
680 significantly more challenging than the task where the colours were highly  
681 discriminable.